REMARKS

This request for continued examination is in response to the Final Office Action, mailed December 14, 2007.

In the patent application, claims 1-20 are pending. In the final office action, the Examiner objects to claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 11, 12 and 18 for informalities and rejects claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 18.

Claim 1 has been amended to change "scrambling the coded symbols in the time-domain" to "scrambling the time-domain coded symbols" as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 1 has also been amended to change the claim language such that the scrambled coded signal is appended as redundancy data in a form of guard interval. The support for the amendment can be found on page 1, line 28 to page 2, line 3 of the specification.

Claim 7 has been amended to change "a signal stream indicative of scrambled coded symbols" to "a signal stream indicative of time-domain scrambled coded symbols", as in claim 1. As with claim 1, claim 7 has also been amended to change the claim language such that the scrambled coded signal is appended as redundancy data in a form of guard interval. The support for the amendment can be found on page 1, line 28 to page 2, line 3 of the specification.

Claims 9, 12 and 18 have been amended to change the claim language such that the scrambled coded signal is appended as redundancy data in a form of guard interval. The support for the amendment can be found on page 1, line 28 to page 2, line 3 of the specification.

Claims 2, 5, 9, 11, 12 and 18 have also been amended to change "a time-domain descrambled signal" to "a scrambled time-domain signal" as suggested by the Examiner. These claims have also been amended to change "a further descrambled signal" to "a further scrambled signal" for consistency.

No new matter has been introduced.

At section 1, claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 11, 12 and 18 are objected to for having informalities. Applicant has amended these claims as suggested by the Examiner.

At section 3, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for having the expression "by redundancy". The examiner stated that, the claim language of appending the scrambled coded signal with a guard interval by redundancy for providing a data stream with the guard interval for transmission is unclear. It is unclear how "redundancy" relates to the scrambled coded signal and/or the guard interval.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 9, 12 and 18 such that the scrambled coded signal are appended as redundancy data in a form of guard interval for providing a data stream with the guard interval for transmission.

It is respectfully submitted that, on page 1, line 28 to page 2, line 3 of the specification, it is disclosed that the output of IFFF is converted from parallel to serial (P/S), and inserted by the redundancy in the form of a guard interval (GI) of a length greater than maximum delay spread. As shown in Figure 2 and disclosed on page 10, line 32 to page 11, line 9, the coded bits become coded symbols 116 or B(k). The IFFF output from the N-point IFFF block is converted by the P/S block. The conventional symbols b(n) are scrambled in time domain by the long scrambling sequence to become a scrambled signal (Equation 14). The scrambled (OFDM) signal is GI inserted for transmission.

Applicant believes that the claim language in claims 1, 7, 9, 12 and 18 " the scrambled coded signal are appended as redundancy data in a form of guard interval for providing a data stream with the guard interval for transmission" is consistent with the description in the specification.

CONCLUSION

As amended, claims 1-20 are allowable. Early allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken Lao

Kenneth Q. Lao
Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 40,061

April 11, 2008

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955